DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 197 430 EA 013 249

AUTHOR Sistrunk, Walter E.: Jenkins, Elton R.
TITLE The Preferred Leadership Style of School Superintendents.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 46p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (9th, New Orleans, LA, November 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes: Administrator Role: Elementary Secondary Education: *Leadership Styles: Questionnaires: State Surveys: *Superintendents
IDENTIFIERS Mississippi

ABSTRACT

Using a "management opinionnaire," researchers surveyed 164 local school superintendents in the state of Mississippi to determine their preferred styles of leadership. The questionnaire requested demographic information and measured the superintendents' degree of accordance with 27 statements concerning the role of an administrator. Analysis of the data collected indicates that the superintendents favor two leadership styles. In general younger superintendents with fewer years of experience prefer management-by-integration, while older, more experienced superintendents prefer management-by-balance. A copy of the questionnaire is appended. (Author/WD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED197430

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE PREFERRED LEADERSHIP STYLE OF SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS

By

Walter E. Sistrunk
Professor of Educational Leadership
Mississippi State University

and

Elton R. Jenkins
Educational Consultant
Mid-Atlantic/Appalachain Race Desegregation
Assistance Center

Bureau of Educational Research
Mississippi State University

Mississippi State does not discriminate on the grounds of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or handicap.

Presented at
Mid-South Educational Research Association
Fall Conference, 1980
New Orleans, Louisiana

EA 013 249

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. E. Sistrunk

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study investigated the preferred styles of leadership of Mississippi Public School Superintendents.

The style of leadership has become a prime determinant of sound management practices in educational systems. As a result, leadership styles that utilize modern principles and concepts are believed to be a means of propelling organizations efficiently and effectively toward realization of goals.[1] Research provides firm evidence that productive managers know and apply modern principles of management to a much greater degree than less productive managers. A basic difference in production results from differing beliefs about human needs in organizations.[2]

Individual and group needs are not always considered important to achievement of organizational goals. Traditional organizational theories tend toward a mechanistic view of the individual, with specific methods that provide for control and direction of the worker.[3]

---

[1]Stephen J. Knezevich, Administration of Public Education (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1969), p. 8.

[2]Rennis Likert, New Patterns of Management (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961), p. 3.

[3]Gordon Lippitt, Organization Renewal: Achieving Vitality in a Changing World (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969), p. 16.

Mechanistic views of employees hamper the efforts of organizations to achieve desirable outcomes. Hence, researchers persist in their efforts to find better ways to harmonize the needs of the individual with those of the organization.[4] Studies produced by these researchers show that the acceptance of a particular style of leadership by educational administrators is largely determined by their personal philosophies and value dispositions. The resulting effect is a set of leadership behaviors that influence the success or failure of educational management.[5]

Educational leaders interact with their subordinates. Therefore, consideration must be given to the effect of leadership behavior on subordinates.[6] Some leadership styles are more effective than others in promoting employee satisfaction and achievement. Leadership behavior that recognizes the importance of both group maintenance and group achievement enhances organizational goal achievement.[7] Satisfying one dimension of these behaviors

---

[4]Ibid.

[5]E. G. Bogue, "The Context of Organizational Behavior: A Conceptual Synthesis for the Educational Manager," cited in Theory Development and Educational Administration ed. Eddy J. VanMeter (New York: MSS Information Corporation, 1973), p. 172.

[6]Fenwick W. English, School Organization and Management (Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1973), p. 3.

[7]Andrew W. Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1966), p. 41.

while denying the importance of the other produces dysfunction in organizations.

If goal achievement and group maintenance are accepted as important aspects of organizational behavior, then educational leaders must find ways to achieve goals while maintaining the group. New and alternative styles of leadership must replace older ones.[8] McNally, as an alternative, suggested the use of participatory management as a necessary means of building group morale, group cohesion, and reaching better decisions.[9]

Fensh and Wilson supported McNally's call for participatory management through their assertion that both individual and organizational needs are more easily met through employee involvement in helping solve organizational problems. Many educational managers do not possess a reservoir of knowledge and skills that facilitates sound decisions in all kinds of activities.[10] This lack of expertise of some educational leaders in some administrative functions has led writers such as Cunningham and James to call for a redefinition of

---

[8]E. G. Bogue and Robert L. Saunders, The Educational Manager: Artist and Practitioner (Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1976), p. 60.

[9]Harold J. McNally, "The Administrative Team: A Matter of Trust," The National Elementary Principal IIII (November-December 1973), p. 15.

[10]Edward A. Fensh and Robert E. Wilson, The Superintendency Team (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1964), p. 3.

roles. The redefined role would recognize leadership of educational systems as a team process.[11]

Leadership sharing is usually confined to a limited number of organizational activities. The educational leader needs a system to help him coordinate and effectively control all of the functions expected of him. Schleh asserted that a management system should be instituted whenever the number of decisional areas requiring an educational manager's attention outgrows his ability to make effective decisions in each task area.[12] The shared management process provides organizational direction by allowing the membership to define and plan objectives that lead to successful goal achievement. Once organizational purposes are established, commitment must be gained from all personnel to the organizational goals.[13]

Successful management practices require that organizations establish goals and methods useful in measuring attainment of them. Lippitt recognized the importance of setting goals but warned

---

[11] Luvern L. Cunningham and H. Thomas James, Governing Schools: New Approaches to Old Issues (Columbus, Ohio: A Bell and Howell Company, 1971), p. 224.

[12] Edward C. Schleh, Management by Results: The Dynamics of Profitable Management (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961), p. 7.

[13] Management by Objectives and Results: A Guidebook for Today's Executive (Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators, 1973), pp. 4-5.

that the process is complex because of constant changes in organizational situations. He further added that in many cases the goal setting process can be completely unpredictable.[14]

Because of the seeming lack of direction in many educational institutions, leaders of these organizations are under pressure from the public to produce measurable results. Community hostility towards the public schools is increasing. Collective bargaining action by teachers has become common. Students openly express negative attitudes concerning the quality of their educational experiences.[15] Everywhere, concern is being expressed over the kind and extent of the education offered by the public schools.

In spite of widespread concern, the publics' belief in a free and accountable educational system has grown. As Lessinger asserted, the public continues to press for equality of results for its educational dollars.[16] Nixon stated "Ironic though it is, the avoidance of accountability is the single most serious threat to a continued, and even more pluralistic educational system."[17] Drucker asserted that unless educational institutions increase their effectiveness in educating students, they risk the possibility that their functions

---

[14]Lippitt, p. 14.

[15]Cunningham and James, p. 221.

[16]Leon Lessinger, "Engineering Accountability for Results in Public Education," Phi Delta Kappan 52 (December 1970):222.

[17]Richard M. Nixon, "Message on Educational Reform," American Education 6 (April 1970):31.

will be passed on to some other societal institution.[18] Educational leaders have little choice but to accept this important challenge.

Educators' responses to pressure for better performance can only be brought about through styles of leadership that are vastly different from those in commerce.[19] The development and coordination of these responses must begin with top level administrators.[20] With newer, and hopefully more effective, styles of leadership being developed through social science research, superintendents may be able to select a style of leadership that will steer educational systems toward more desirable outcomes.[21,22]

If effective leadership and increased educational performance are gained through the use of modern principles of management produced from social science research, then a study of the efficacy of this research on leadership behavior in educational systems is warranted.[23]

The Problem

The problem was to determine if there were significant differences in preferred styles of leadership of Mississippi School Superintendents.

---

[18]Peter Drucker, "School Around the Bend," Psychology 6 (June 1972):86.

[19]Donald E. Tope, The Social Sciences View School Administration (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), p. 25.

[20]National Academy for School Executives (Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators, 1973), p. 25.

[21]Knezevich, p. 8.

[22]Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton, Group Dynamics: Key to Decision-Making (Houston: Gulf Publishing Company, 1961), p. 5.

[23]Lippitt, p. 12.

As a means of structuring the problem, answers were sought to the following questions:

1. Were there significant differences in school superintendents choice of the following opposing styles of managerial leadership:

a. Management-by-integration (Theory Y) and Management-by-direction (Theory X)

b. Management-by-agreement (Theory 9,9) and Management-by-balance (Theory 5,5)

c. Management-by-agreement (Theory 9,9) and Management-by-non-involvement (Theory 1,1)

d. Management-by-agreement (Theory 9,9) and Management-by-support (Theory 1,9)

e. Management-by-agreement (Theory 9,9) and Management-by-authority (Theory 9,1)

f. Management-by-balance (Theory 5,5) and Management-by-non-involvement (Theory 1,1)

g. Management-by-balance (Theory 5,5) and Management-by-support (Theory 1,9)

h. Management-by-balance (Theory 5,5) and Management-by authority (Theory 9,1)

i. Management-by-non-involvement (Theory 1,1) and Management-by-support (Theory 1 9)

j. Management-by-non-involvement (Theory 1,1) and Management-by-authority (Theory 9,1)

k. Management-by-support (Theory 1,9) and Management-by authority (Theory 9,1)

2. Were there significant differences between appointed and elected superintendents in choice of the following opposing styles of managerial leadership:

a. Management-by-integration (Theory Y) and Management-by direction (Theory X)

b. Management-by-agreement (Theory 9,9) and Management-by-balance (Theory 5,5)

c. Management-by-agreement (Theory 9,9) and Management-by-non-involvement (Theory 1,1)

d. Management-by-agreement (Theory 9,9) and Management-by support (Theory 1,9)

e. Management-by-agreement (Theory 9,9) and Management-by-authority (Theory 9,1)

f. Management-by-balance (Theory 5,5) and Management-by-non-involvement (Theory 1,1)

g. Management-by-balance (Theory 5,5) and Management-by-support (Theory 1,9)

h. Management-by-balance (Theory 5,5) and Management-by-authority (Theory 9,1)

i. Management-by-non-involvement (Theory 1,1) and Management-by-support (Theory 1,9)

j. Management-by-non-involvement (Theory 1,1) and Management-by-authority (Theory 9,1)

k. Management-by-support (Theory 1,9) and Management-by-authority (Theory 9,1)

3. Were there significant differences among the responses of the superintendents when the variables of experience, age, acquisition of position, level of certification, race, and size of school district were considered.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined as they were used in this study.

Leadership--A term used to indicate the ability of a person to guide other persons toward desired goals.

Decision-Making--A process which calls for group participation in deciding upon the plans for an organization.

Organization--A term used to indicate a structure which is made up of people.

Organizational Structure--Frames of reference under which people work, i. e. behaviors of organization.

Executive educational manager--A term used to identify a superintendent, associate and/or assistant superintendent, director of a special program, supervisor and/or coordinator, or school principal.[24]

Management-by-direction (Theory X)--A term used to describe the process of getting things done in an organization by directing people.

---

[24]Carter V. Good, Dictionary of Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1973).

Management-by-integration (Theory Y)--A term used to describe the process of getting things done in an organization by people working cooperatively together.[25]

Management-by-authority (Theory 9,1)--A term used to describe the process of getting things done in an organization by ordering people to perform.

Management-by-support (Thoery 1,9)--A term used to describe the process of getting things done in an organization by encouraging people through personal identity and understanding so that they feel loyalty.

Management-by-non-involvement (Theory 1,1)--A term used to describe the process of getting things done in an organization with minimum influence over people.

Management-by-balance (Theory 5,5)--A term used to describe the process of getting things done in an organization by telling people what to do but with explanatory reasons.

Management-by-agreement (Theory 9,9)--A term used to describe the process of getting things done in an organization by people reaching mutual agreement.[26]

Forces within the executive educational manager--Refer to opinionnaire statements 1, 2, 7, 10, 11, 16, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, and 27

---

[25]Douglas McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1969), pp. 33-34. 47-49.

[26]Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton, The Managerial Grid: Key Orientation for Achieving Production Through People (Houston: Gulf Publishing Company, 1964), pp, 18-48, 57-80, 85-105, 110-36, 142-80.

and infer those beliefs and values that an executive educational manager holds about himself.

Forces within the subordinate workers--Refer to opinionnaire statements 8, 9, 14, 15, 19, and 24 and infer those beliefs that an executive educational manager feels his subordinate workers should hold for themselves.

Forces within the organization--Refer to opinionnaire statements 3, 4, 5, 6, 12, 13, 17, 18, and 22 and infer those beliefs that an executive educational manager holds for the type of organization in which he works.[27]

Limitations

This study was limited to the superintendents of public school districts in the state of Mississippi. The data collected apply only to superintendents and conditions that existed during the 1979-1980 school year. The opinionnaire was mailed in the spring of 1980. The researcher assumed that each respondent understood the opinionnaire and responded to the specific statements with sincerity and candor.

---

[27]Robert Tannenbaum, Irving R. Weschler, and Fred Massrik, Leadership and Organization: A Behavioral Science Approach (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961), pp. 73-77.

CHAPTER II

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

Collection of the Data

The subjects studied were the 164 local school superintendents in the state of Mississippi. The anonymity of those answering was assured.

One hundred and twenty-five management opinionnaires were returned. This represented 76.2 percent of the original mailing which was slightly more than the anticipated return rate of 70 percent.

The Instrument

The Management Opinionnaire used for data collection was designed and validated by Webb who used it in North Carolina for a similar study. He developed the 27 statements contained on the Management Opinionnaire from the assumptions supporting Theory X and Theory Y as presented by McGregor and from the assumptions supporting Theory 1,1; Theory 1,9; Theory 9,1; Theory 5,5; and Theory 9,9 as formulated by Blake and Mouton. Webb created as many statements as possible from the assumptions supporting these seven theories of leadership. He developed 41 statements and reduced them to 27 by deleting statements that requested nearly identical information. The Management Opinionnaire was then tested for clarity by submission on three different occasions to a sample of superintendents in the state of North Carolina. A final Management Opinionnaire was then developed.[28]

---

[28] Webb, p. 15.

Part one of the Management Opinionnaire is designed to ascertain personal data from each superintendent as to experience, age, acquisition of position, level of certification, race, and size of school district. Part two of the Management Opinionnaire contains 27 statements and is designed around three specific forces and seven styles of managerial leadership. The three forces are identified as forces within the educational manager, forces within the subordinate workers, and forces within the organization.

"Forces within the executive educational manager" refer to those beliefs and value dispositions that an educational manager holds about himself and include the following opinionnaire statements: 1, 2, 7, 10, 11, 16, 20 21, 23, 25, 26, and 27. "Forces within the subordinate workers" refer to those beliefs that an executive educational manager feels his subordinate workers should hold for themselves and include the following opinionnaire statements: 8, 9, 14, 15, 19, and 24. "Forces within the organization" refer to those beliefs that an executive educational manager holds concerning the type of organization in which he works and include the following opinionnaire statements: 3, 4, 5, 6, 12, 13, 17, 18, and 22.[29]

The seven styles of managerial leadership are based on two opposing theories of management (Theory X and Theory Y) developed by Douglas McGregor in The Human Side of Enterprise[30] and the five theories of management (Theory 1,1; Theory 1,9; Theory 9,1 Theory 5,5; and Theory 9,9) stated by Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton in The Managerial Grid: Key Orientation for Achieving Production Through People.[31]

---

[29]Tannenbaum, Weschler, and Massarik, pp. 73-77.

[30]McGregor, pp. 33-34, 47-49.

[31]Blake and Mouton, pp. 18-48, 57-80, 85-105, 110-36, 142-80.

The seven styles of management include the following:

1. Theory X--Management-by-direction
2. Theory Y--Management-by-integration
3. Theory 1,1--Management-by-non-involvement
4. Theory 1,9--Management-by-support
5. Theory 9,1--Management-by-authority
6. Theory 5,5--Management-by-balance
7. Theory 9,9--Management-by-agreement

Reliability for the instrument was established through a pilot study conducted on 30 subjects enrolled in advanced studies in educational administration at Mississippi State University. An alpha coefficient of .7961 was computed for the instrument. The alpha coefficient of internal consistency reflects the degree of reliability among the items of a scale, in terms of overlapping variance.[32]

Questions

Three questions were used to structure this study. These questions were:

1. Will there be significant differences in school superintendents choice of the following opposing styles of managerial leadership:

   a. Management-by-integration (Theory Y) and management-by-balance (Theory X)

   b. Management-by-agreement (Theory 9,9) and management-by-balance (Theory 5,5)

---

[32] L. J. Cronback, "Coefficient Alpha and the Internal Structure of Tests," Psychometrik, 1951, pp. 297-334.

c. Management-by-agreement (Theory 9,9) and management-by-non-involvement (Theory 1,1)

d. Management-by-agreement (Theory 9,9) and management-by-support (Theory 1,9)

e. Management-by-agreement (Theory 9,9) and management-by-authority (Theory 9,1)

f. Management-by-balance (Theory 5,5) and management-by-non-involvement (Theory 1,1)

g. Management-by-balance (Theory 5,5) and management-by-support (Theory 1,9)

h. Management-by-balance (Theory 5,5) and management-by- authority (Theory 9,1)

i. Management-by-non-involvement (Theory 1,1) and management-by- support (Theory 1,9)

j. Management-by-non-involvement (Theory 1,1) and management-by-authority (Theory 9,1)

k. Management-by-support (Theory 1,9) and management-by-authority (Theory 9,1)

2. Will there be significant differences between appointed and elected superintendents in choice of the following opposing styles of managerial leadership:

a. Management-by-integration (Theory Y) and management-by-direction (Theory X)

b. Management-by-agreement (Theory 9,9) and management-by-balance (Theory 5,5)

c. Management-by-agreement (Theory 9,9) and management-by-non-involvement (Theory 1,1)

d. Management-by-agreement (Theory 9,9) and management-by-support (Theory 1,9)

e. Management-by-agreement (Theory 9,9) and management-by-authoirty (Theory 9,1)

f. Management-by-balance (Theory 5,5) and management-by-non-involvement (Theory 1,1)

g. Management-by-balance (Theory 5,5) and management-by-support (Theory 1,9)

h. Management-by-balance (Theory 5,5) and management-by-authority (Theory 9,1)

i. Management-by-non-involvement (Theory 1,1) and management-by-support (Theory 1,9)

j. Management-by-non-involvement (Theory 1,1) and management-by-authority (Theory 9,1)

k. Management-by-support (Theory 1,9) and management-by-authority (Theory 9,1)

3. Will there be any significant differences among any of the variables and responses for superintendents as related to:

a. experience

b. age

c. acquisition of position

d. level of certification

e. race

f. size of school district

Treatment of Data

The data were analyzed to determine the influence that the three specific forces (forces within the individual, forces within the subordinate worker, and forces within the organization) appeared to have upon the style of management leadership most favored; to determine if there were significant differences in school superintendents' choice of opposing styles of leadership, to test for significance between appointed and elected superintendents as to management leadership style most favored; and to determine if there is any significant interaction among any of the variables and responses for superintendents as related to experience, age, acquisition of position, level of certification, race, and size of school district.

Tabulations of each of the five response categories were made by hand and transferred to data processing cards for computer analysis. Percentages were produced for each response category for each respondent. The opinionnaire responses were then classified according to (1) forces within the executive educational manager, (2) forces within the subordinate workers, and (3) forces within the organization. Additional analyses of the data included the following:

Theory X and Theory Y

1. When 51 percent or more of the responses accumulated under the disagree and strongly disagree categories, management-by-direction (Theory X) was accepted as the style of management leadership most favored.

2. When 51 percent or more of the responses accumulated under the strongly agree and agree categories, management-by-integration (Theory Y) was accepted as the style of management leadership most favored.

3. The percentages of the no opinion category are shown but were not considered in accepting a style of management since they are not considered as complying with either Theory X or Theory Y.

Theory 9,1; Theory 1,9; Theory 1,1; Theory 5,5; and Theory 9,9

1. When 51 percent or more of the responses accumulated under the strongly disagree category, management-by-authority (Theory 9,1) was accepted as the style of management most favored.

2. When 51 percent or more of the responses accumulated under the disagree category, management-by-support (Theory 1,9) was accepted as the style of management leadership most favored.

3. When 51 percent or more of the responses accumulated under the no opinion category, management-by-non-involvement (Theory 1,1) was accepted as the style of management leadership most favored.

4. When 51 percent or more of the responses accumulated under the agree category, management-by-balance (Theory 5,5) was accepted as the style of management leadership most favored.

5. When 51 percent or more of the responses accumulated under the strongly agree category, management-by-agreement was accepted as the style of management leadership most favored.

6. Chi square was the statistic used to test questions 1, 2, and 3. The .05 level of significance was used as the critical value in

determining if there were significant differences between superintendents favoring the seven styles of management leadership.

7. Percentages were used to determine the influence that the three specific forces appeared to have upon thc style of management leadership most favored.

CHAPTER III

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter summarizes the findings of the study and presents the conclusions drawn from these findings. Recommendations for further study are included.

Summary

The findings relative to this study were based upon the responses of 125 Mississippi local school superintendents. The participating superintendents responded to a Management Opinionnaire containing 27 statements. Each statement had five response categories: (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) no opinion, (4) disagree, and (5) strongly disagree. The superintendents were asked to respond to only one of the categories for each statement.

Responses to the opinionnaire statements were classified according to three specific forces and seven styles of management leadership. The three forces were identified as forces within the executive educational manager, forces within the subordinate workers, and forces within the organization. The seven styles of management leadership were based upon the two opposing theories of management (Theory X and Y) as presented by Douglas McGregor and the five opposing theories of management (Theory 1,1; Theory 1,9; Theory 9,1; Theory 5,5; and Theory 9,9) as formulated by Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton. The seven styles of management leadership are as follows:

1. Theory X--Management-by-direction
2. Theory Y--Management-by-integration
3. Theory 1,1--Management-by-non-involvement
4. Theory 1,9--Management-by-support
5. Theory 9,1--Management-by-authority

6. Theory 5,5--Management-by-balance

7. Theory 9,9--Management-by-agreement

The three questions used to structure the study were tested through the use of the chi square statistic. The .05 level of significance (3.84) was used as the critical value. Percentages were used to determine the influence that the three specific forces appeared to have on the style of management leadership most favored by superintendents.

Question number 1 sought to determine if there were significant differences between the percentage of superintendents choosing the following opposing styles of management leadership:

a. Management-by-integration (Theory Y) and management-by-direction (Theory X)

b. Management-by-agreement (Theory 9,9) and management-by-balance (Theory 5,5)

c. Management-by-agreement (Theory 9,9) and management-by-non-involvement (Theory 1,1)

d. Management-by-agreement (Theory 9,9) and management-by-support (Theory 1,9)

e. Management-by-agreement (Theory 9,9) and management-by-authority (Theory 9,1)

f. Management-by-balance (Theory 5,5) and management-by-non-involvement (Theory 1,1)

g. Management-by-balance (Theory 5,5) and management-by-support (Theory 1,9)

h. Management-by-balance (Theory 5,5) and management-by-authority (Theory 9,1)

i. Management-by-non-involvement (Theory 1,1) and management-by-support (Theory 1,9)

j. Management-by-non-involvement (Theory 1,1) and management-by-authority (Theory 9,1)

k. Management-by-support (Theory 1,9) and management-by-authority (Theory 9,1)

Management by-Integration and Management-by-Direction. Percentages were produced to classify the responses of superintendents as to whether they favored management-by-integration or management-by-direction for forces within the executive educational manager, forces within the subordinate workers, and forces within the organization.

The percentages for the combined forces revealed that 94.7 percent of the superintendents favored management-by-integration, 0.8 percent of the superintendents favored management-by-direction, and that 4.5 percent of the superintendents could not be classified as favoring either of the two opposing styles of management leadership.

The chi square statistic was used to test for significant differences between the percent of superintendents favoring each of the two opposing styles of management leadership. A significant difference was found between the percent of superintendents favoring each of the two opposing styles of management leadership. The proportion of superintendents favoring management-by-integration was greater than the proportion of superintendents favoring management-by-direction. Management-by-integration was favored over management-by-direction.

The three specific forces appeared to have little effect on the management leadership style most favored by superintendents since 83.2 percent of the responses of superintendents were consistent throughout the three specific forces.

Management-by-Agreement, Management-by-Balance, Management-by-Non-Involvement, Management-by-Support, and Management-by-Authority. The five management leadership styles were classified from the percentage of responses of superintendents according to forces within the executive educational manager, forces within the subordinate workers, and forces within the organization.

The percentages for the combined forces revealed that 13.1 percent of the superintendents favored management-by-agreement, 61.8 percent of the superintendents favored management-by-balance, 1.1 percent of the superintendents favored management-by-non-involvement, .5 percent of the superintendents favored management-by-support, none of the superintendents favored management-by-authority, and that 23.5 percent of the superintendents could not be classified as favoring any one of the five styles of management leadership.

The chi square statistic was used to test for significant differences between the percent of superintendents favoring management-by-agreement, management-by-balance, management-by-non-involvement, management-by-support, and management-by-authority.

A significant difference was found between the percent of superintendents favoring each of the five styles of management leadership. To locate this difference, the five styles of management leadership were compared interchangeable.

Management-by-Agreement and Management-by-Balance. A significant difference was found between the percent of superintendents favoring management-by-agreement and the percent of superintendents favoring management-by-balance. The proportion of superintendents

favoring management-by-balance was greater than the proportion of superintendents favoring management-by-agreement. Management-by-balance was favored over management-by-agreement.

Management-by-Agreement and Management-by-Non-Involvement. A significant difference was found between the percent of superintendents favoring management-by-agreement and the percent of superintendents favoring management-by-non-involvement. The proportion of superintendents favoring management-by-agreement was greater than the proportion of superintendents favoring management-by-non-involvement. Management-by-agreement was favored over management-by-non-involvement.

Management-by-Agreement and Management-by-Support. A significant difference was found between the percent of superintendents favoring management-by-agreement and the percent of superintendents favoring management-by-support. The porportion of superintendents favoring management-by-agreement was greater than the proportion of superintendents favoring management-by-support. Management-by-agreement was favored over management-by-support.

Management-by-Agreement and Management-by-Authority. Management-by-agreement and management-by-authority could not be tested because none of the superintendents favored management-by-authority.

Management-by-Balance and Management-by-Non-Involvement. A significant difference was found between the percent of superintendents favoring management-by-balance and the percent of superintendents favoring management-by-non-involvement. The proportion of superintendents favoring management-by-balance was greater than the proportion

of superintendents favoring management-by-non-involvement. Management-by-balance was favored over management-by-non-involvement.

Management-by-Balance and Management-by-Support. A significant difference was found between the percent of superintendents favoring management-by-balance and the percent of superintendents favoring management-by-support. The proportion of superintendents favoring management-by-balance was greater than the proportion of superintendents favoring management-by-support. Management-by-balance was favored over management-by-support.

Management-by-Balance and Management-by-Authority. Management-by-balance and management-by-authority could not be tested because none of the superintendents favored management-by-authority.

Management-by-Non-Involvement and Management-by-Support. There was no significant differences found between the percent of superintendents favoring management-by-non-involvement and management-by-support. Neither leadership style was favored over the other.

Management-by-Non-Involvement and Management-by-Authority. Management-by-non-involvement and management-by-authority could not be tested because none of the superintendents favored management-by-authority.

Management-by-Support and Management-by-Authority. Management-by-support and management-by-authority could not be tested because none of the superintendents favored management-by-authority.

The three specific forces appeared to have some influence on the style of management leadership most favored by superintendents because 36.8 percent of the superintendents were inconsistent in

favoring either management-by-agreement or management-by-balance throughout all three forces.

Question number 2 of the study sought to determine if there were significant differences between elected and appointed superintendents in their choice of the following opposing styles of management leadership:

a. Management-by-integration (Theory Y) and management-by-direction (Theory X)

b. Management-by-agreement (Theory 9,9) and management-by-balance (Theory 5,5)

c. Management-by-agreement (Theory 9,9) and management-by-non-involvement (Theory 1,1)

d. Management-by-agreement (Theory 9,9) and management-by-support (Theory 1,9)

e. Management-by-agreement (Theory 9,9) and management-by-authority (Theory 9,1)

f. Management-by-balance (Theory 5,5) and management-by-non-involvement (Theory 1,1)

g. Management-by-balance (Theory 5,5) and management-by-support (Theory 1,9)

h. Management-by-balance (Theory 5,5) and management-by-authority (Theory 9,1)

i. Management-by-non-involvement (Theory 1,1) and management-by-support (Theory 1,9)

j. Management-by-non-involvement (Theory 1,1) and management-by-authority (Theory 9,1)

k. Management-by-support (Theory 1,9) and management-by-authority (Theory 9,1)

Management-by-Integration and Management-by-Direction. Percentages were produced to classify both elected and appointed superintendents as to choice of management-by-integration or management-by-direction for forces within the executive educational manager, forces within the subordinate workers, and forces within the organization.

The percentages for the combined forces revealed that 96.6 percent of the 69 elected superintendents favored management-by-integration; while 91 percent of the 56 appointed superintendents favored management-by-integration, .4 percent of the 56 appointed superintendents favored management-by-direction while .6 percent of the 69 elected superintendents favored management-by-direction, and that 3.3 percent of the responses of the 56 appointed superintendents could not be classified as favoring either management-by-integration or management-by-direction; while 8.4 percent of the responses of the 69 elected superintendents could not be classified as favoring either management-by-integration or management-by-direction.

The chi square statistic was used to test for significant differences between the percent of appointed and the percent of elected superintendents favoring management-by-integration and management-dy-direction.

A significant difference was found between the percent of appointed and the percent of elected superintendents in their choice of management-by-integration and management-by-direction.

The proportion of elected superintendents who favor management-by-integration and management-by-direction was greater than the proportion of appointed superintendents who favor management-by-integration.

The three forces appeared to have little effect on elected and appointed superintendents in their choice of management-by-integration and management-by-direction. The percent of elected superintendents favoring management-by-integration throughout all three forces was 88.4 and the percent of appointed superintendents favoring management-by-integration throughout all three forces was 73.2.

Management-by-Agreement, Management-by-Balance, Management-by-Non-Involvement, Management-by-Support and Management-by-Authority. The five management leadership styles were classified from the percentage of responses of elected and appointed superintendents according to forces within the executive manager, forces within the subordinate workers, and forces within the organization.

The percentages for the combined forces revealed that 13.5 percent of the appointed superintendents favored management-by-agreement while 10.1 percent of the elected superintendents favored management-by-agreement, 60 percent of the elected superintendents favored management-by-balance while 67.2 percent of the appointed superintendents favored management-by-balance, .47 percent of the appointed superintendents favored management-by-non-involvement while 1.8 percent of the elected superintendents favored management-by-non-involvement, .47 percent of the appointed superintendents favored

management-by-support while .6 percent of the elected superintendents favored management-by-support, none of the appointed or elected superintendents favored management-by-authority, and that 25.6 percent of the elected superintendents and 20.2 percent of the appointed superintendents could not be classified as favoring any one of the five styles of management leadership.

The chi square statistic was used to test for significant differences between the percent of elected and the percent of appointed superintendents in their choice of the five styles of management leadership. A significant difference was found between the percent of elected and the percent of appointed superintendents in their choice of the five styles of management leadership. To locate this difference, the five styles of management leadership were compared interchangeably.

Management-by-Agreement and Management-by-Balance. A significant difference was found between the percent of elected superintendents and the percent of appointed superintendents in their choice of management-by-agreement and management-by-balance. The proportion of elected superintendents who favor management-by-agreement and management-by-balance was significantly greater than the proportion of appointed superintendents who favor management-by-agreement and management-by-balance.

Management-by-Agreement and Management-by-Non-Involvement. A significant difference was found between the percent of elected superintendents and the percent of appointed superintendents in their choice of management-by-agreement and management-by-non-involvement.

The proportion of elected superintendents who favored management-by-agreement and management-by-non-involvement was greater than the proportion of appointed superintendents who favor management-by-agreement and management-by-non-involvement.

Management-by-Agreement and Management-by-Support. A significant difference was found between the percent of elected superintendents and the percent of appointed superintendents in their choice of management-by-agreement and management-by-support. The proportion of elected superintendents who favored management-by-agreement and management-by-support was greater than the proportion of appointed superintendents who favored management-by-agreement and management-by-support.

Management-by-Agreement and Management-by-Authority. Management-by-agreement and management-by-authority could not be tested because none of the elected or appointed superintendents favored management-by-authority.

Management-by-Balance and Management-by-Non-Involvement. No significant difference was found between the percent of elected superintendents and the percent of appointed superintendents in their choice of management-by-balance and management-by-non-involvement.

Management-by-Balance and Management-by-Support. No significant difference was found between the percent of elected superintendents and the percent of appointed superintendents in their choice of management-by-balance and management-by-support.

Management-by-Balance and Management-by-Authority. Management-by-balance and management-by-authority could not be tested because none

of the appointed or elected superintendents favored management-by-authority.

Management-by-Non-Involvement and Management-by-Support. No significant difference was found between the percent of elected superintendents and the percent of appointed superintendents in their choice of management-by-non-involvement and management-by-support.

Management-by-Non-Involvement and Management-by-Authority. Management-by-non-involvement and management-by-authority could not be tested because none of the elected or appointed superintendents favored management-by-authority.

Management-by-Support and Management-by-Authority. Management-by-support and management-by-authority could not be tested because none of the elected or appointed superintendents favored management-by-authority.

The three forces appeared to influence the style of management leadership most favored by elected and appointed superintendents a majority of the time since 72.5 percent of the elected superintendents and 69.6 percent of the appointed superintendents were inconsistent in favoring either management-by-agreement or management-by-balance throughout all three forces.

Question number 3 sought to determine the effect of experience, age, acquisition of position, level of certification, ethnic group, and size of school district on the management leadership most favored by superintendents.

The responses were analyzed according to forces within the executive educational manager, forces within the subordinate workers,

and forces within the organization. Percentages were used to represent the number of superintendents favoring a particular style of management leadership for each of the three forces. The percentages were then averaged to yield a composite percentage across the three forces.

The chi square statistic was used to test for significant differences between the independent variables of experience, age, acquisition of position, level of certification, ethnic group, size of school district, and the style of management leadership most favored by superintendents.

Conclusions

The findings relative to this study indicate that Mississippi school superintendents favor the two leadership styles of management-by-integration and management-by-balance. Elected and appointed superintendents favored management-by-integration and management-by-balance also. When the effect of the demographic variables were considered, one group of superintendents favored management-by-integration and the other group of superintendents favored management-by-balance.

Superintendents working in school districts serving between 2000-5000 students, have four years of experience or less, hold AA certification, 35-50 years of age, are more likely to embrace management-by-integration as their preferred leadership style. On the other hand, superintendents with 5-8 years of experience, hold AA certification, 50 years of age or older, are more likely to embrace management-by-balance as their preferred style of leadership.

Further, superintendents in the state of Mississippi indicate their flexibility in leadership styles through their acceptance of the mixed approaches of management-by-integration and management-by-balance.

APPENDIX

Management Opinionnaire Mailed to Superintendents

MANAGEMENT OPINIONNAIRE

Part I

1. How many years, including this year, have you been a superintendent?

   1 - 4_____ 5 - 8_____ 9 -12_____ over 12_____

2. Please indicate your age group:

   under 35_____ 35 - 50_____ over 50_____

3. Please indicate how you obtained your position:

   elected_____ appointed_____

4. Please check the highest certification held:

   AA_____ AAA_____ AAAA_____

5. Please indicate your ethnic group:

   white_____ black_____ hispanic_____ oriental_____

6. Please check how many pupils are served by your district:

   under 2000_____ 2000 - 5000_____ over 5000_____

Part II

Instructions:

1. Please check ( ) the blank beside the response which most nearly describes your answer. Check one response for each statement.

2. Consider an executive educational manager to be a superintendent, associate and/or assistant superintendent, director of a special program, supervisor and/or coordinator, or school principal.

3. Use the following definitions in determining your responses:

   Strongly Agree-----Complete acceptance of statement as being true.

   Agree----------Acceptance of statement as being true but not with complete assent.

No Opinion---------Do not wish to respond to statement.

Disagree-----------Rejection of statement as being true but not with complete discord.

Strongly Disagree--Complete rejection of statement as being true.

---

1. You consider that one of the most important job responsibilities of an executive educational manager is the stimulation of his subordinate workers to produce high standards of performance.

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
____	____	____	____	____

2. As an executive educational manager, you feel that those subordinate workers who are affected by the decisions made in a local school system should be allowed to participate in the decision-making process.

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
____	____	____	____	____

3. You feel that a more realistic fulfillment of objectives and attainment of goals can result if the organizational structure provides for a systematic, step-by-step procedure.

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
____	____	____	____	____

4. You feel that the organizational structure of a local school system should provide for the evaluation of executive educational managers on agreed upon competencies which have been stated in measurable terms.

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
____	____	____	____	____

5. You believe that a local system will meet with more success when the behaviors of the organization and the behaviors of the subordinate workers are developed and directed together.

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
____	____	____	____	____

6. You consider that the establishment of group-written organizational objectives and goals is an effective way for executive educational managers and subordinate workers to communicate.

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
____	____	____	____	____

7. You believe that an executive educational manager should be able to fulfill his responsibility without having to exert his authority.

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
___	___	___	___	___

8. As an executive educational manager, you believe that your subordinate workers are capable of providing self-control in their work.

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
___	___	___	___	___

9. You regard that subordinate workers should realize that certain unavoidable situations occur in any organization.

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
___	___	___	___	___

10. You feel that the subordinate workers in an organization should be evaluated on measurable competencies which they have helped to establish.

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
___	___	___	___	___

11. You regard that the personal satisfaction achieved from the fulfillment of objectives and the attainment of goals are all the rewards needed by an executive educational manager.

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
___	___	___	___	___

12. You believe that executive educational managers in a local school system perform best when they work under agreed upon job descriptions and organizational charts.

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
___	___	___	___	___

13. You believe that the potential needs of subordinates should be provided for by the organizational structure.

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
___	___	___	___	___

14. As an executive educational manager, you believe that your subordinate workers are capable of motivating themselves in their work.

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
___	___	___	___	___

15. As an executive educational manager, you feel that your subordinate workers will become committed to the purposes of a local school system if they can sense a realistic fulfillment of objectives and attainment of goals.

Strongly Agree ____ Agree____ No Opinion____ Disagree____ Strongly Disagree____

16. You feel that an executive educational manager should be a creative and imaginative person.

Strongly Agree ____ Agree____ No Opinion____ Disagree____ Strongly Disagree____

17. You believe that subordinate workers in a local school system can perform their best work when they are guided by job descriptions and organizational charts with which they agree.

Strongly Agree ____ Agree____ No Opinion____ Disagree____ Strongly Disagree____

18. You believe that positive results will occur in a local school system when the behaviors of the organization and the behaviors of executive educational managers are mutually developed and channeled in the same direction.

Strongly Agree ____ Agree____ No Opinion____ Disagree____ Strongly Disagree____

19. As an executive educational manager, you believe that your subordinate workers are capable of exercising self-direction in their work.

Strongly Agree ____ Agree____ No Opinion____ Disagree____ Strongly Disagree____

20. You regard that executive educational managers should acknowledge the fact that uncertainties arise in any organizational structure.

Strongly Agree ____ Agree____ No Opinion____ Disagree____ Strongly Disagree____

21. You believe that an executive educational manager should not only accept responsibility entrusted to him but that he should also seek responsibility.

Strongly Agree ____ Agree____ No Opinion____ Disagree____ Strongly Disagree____

22. You believe that the organizational structure of a local school system should be adaptable to the potential needs of executive educational managers.

Strongly Agree ___ Agree___ No Opinion___ Disagree___ Strongly Disagree___

23. You feel that an executive educational manager must be aware of the many ways to organize problems for solutions.

Strongly Agree ___ Agree___ No Opinion___ Disagree___ Strongly Disagree___

24. As an executive educational manager, you believe that your subordinate workers want to become involved in the activities of a local school system because they like their work.

Strongly Agree ___ Agree___ No Opinion___ Disagree___ Strongly Disagree___

25. You believe that the most effective communication in a local school system is that communication which flows from subordinate workers upward to executive educational managers.

Strongly Agree ___ Agree___ No Opinion___ Disagree___ Strongly Disagree___

26. You believe that an executive educational manager must individualize his methods when working with his subordinate workers.

Strongly Agree ___ Agree___ No Opinion___ Disagree___ Strongly Disagree___

27. You feel that an executive educational manager can only become effective through specific knowledge and experience.

Strongly Agree ___ Agree___ No Opinion___ Disagree___ Strongly Disagree___

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Argyris, Chris. Personality and Organization: A Behavioral Science Approach. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1957.

Blake, Robert R., and Mouton, Jane S. The Managerial Grid: Key Orientation for Achieving Production through People. Houston: Gulf Publishing Company, 1964.

Bogue, E. G. "The Context of Organizational Behavior: A Conceptual Synthesis for the Educational Manager," cited by Eddy VanMeter, ed., Theory Development and Educational Administration, p. 172. New York: MSS Information Company, 1973.

Bogue, E. G., and Saunders, Robert L. The Educational Manager: Artist and Practitioner. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1976.

Culbertson, Jack A.; Jacobson, Paul B.; and Reller, Theodore L. Administrative Relations: A Casebook. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960.

Cunningham, Luvern L., and James, H. Thomas. Governing Schools: New Approaches to Old Issues. Columbus, Ohio: A Bell and Howell Company, 1971.

Dimock, Marshall E. Administrative Vitality. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.

Doll, Ronald C. Curriculum Improvement: Decision-Making and Progress. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1970.

Ecke, Paul et al. Handbook for Supervisors. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.

English, Fenwick W. School Organization and Management. Wrothington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1975.

Fensh, Edward A., and Wilson, Robert E. The Superintendency Team. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1964.

Getzels, Jacob W. et al. Educational Administration as a Social Process. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc., 1968.

Good, Carter V. Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1964.

Gouldner, Alvin. Studies in Leadership. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

Halpin, Andrew W. Theory and Research in Administration. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1964.

Knezevich, Stephen J. Administration of Public Education. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.

Leeper, Robert R., and Wilhelm, Fred T. Supervision: Emerging Profession. Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1969.

Likert, Rennis. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961.

Lippitt, Gordon. Organization Renewal: Achieving Vitality in a Changing World. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969.

Lucio, William H., and McNeil, John D. Supervision: A Synthesis of Thought and Action. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969.

Management by Objectives and Results: A Guidebook for Today's Executive. Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators, 1973.

McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1969.

Mort, Paul B. Principles of School Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1946.

Metcalf, Henry, and Urwick, L. Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers on Mary Parker Follett. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers.

Morphet, Edgar L.; Johns, Roe L.; and Reller, Theodore L. Educational Administration: Concepts, Practices and Issues. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.

Owens, Robert G. Organizational Behavior in Schools. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Ross, Murray G., and Hendry, Charles E. New Understandings of Leadership: A Survey of Application and Research. New York: Association Press, 1957.

Sachs, Bejamin. Educational Administration: A Behavioral Science Approach. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1966.

Schleh, Edward C. Management by Results: The Dynamics of Profitable Management. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J., and Carver, Fred D. The New School Executive: A Theory of Administration. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1973.

Shane, Harold G., and Yauch, Wilbur A. Creative School Administration. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1957.

Stoops, Emery, and Johnson, Russell E. Elementary School Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969.

Tannenbaum, Robert; and Weschler, Irving R.; and Massarik, Fred. Leadership and Organization: A Behavioral Science Approach. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961.

Tope, Donald E. The Social Sciences View School Administration. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

Periodicals and Other Sources

Allen, Louis A. "M for Management: Theory Y Updated." Personnel Journal 52 (December 1973):1063-1065.

Benney, Lewis A. "Changes in Organizational Climate Associated with the Development and Implementation of an Educational Management System" (A Paper Presented at the American Research Association Meeting, 58th, New Orleans, Louisiana, Feb. 26-March 1, 1973), pp. 1-13.

Barnardin, John H., and Alvares, Kenneth. "The Managerial Grid as a Predictor of Role Conflict Resolution Method and Managerial Effectiveness." Administrative Science Quarterly 21 (March 1976):84-92.

Cronback, L. J. "Coefficient Alpha and the Internal Structure of Tests." Psychometrika (1951):297-334.

Drucker, Peter. "School Around the Bend." Psychology 6 (June 1972): 86.

Harrison, Frank. "Dimensions of Leadership." Journal of General Management 4 (Autumn 1976):59.

Harrison, Frank. "Organizational Correlates of Perceived Role Performance at the University and College Level." Academy of Management Journal (June 1973):227-238.

Lessinger, Leon. "Engineering Accountability for Results in Public Education," Phi Delta Kappan 52 (December 1970):222.

McNally, Harold J. "The Administrative Team: A Matter of Trust." The National Elementary Principal 4 (November-December 1973): 15.

National Academy for School Executives, Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators, 1973, p. 25.

Nixon, Richard M. "Message on Educational Reform." American Education 6 (April 1970):31.

Stogdill, Ralph M. "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature." Journal of Psychology 25 (January 1948):63.

Tead, Ordway. "Problems of Administration in a Democratic Society." Management Series No. 52 (September 17, 1951):7.

Unpublished Materials

Kelly, Wilbur R. "The Relationship Between Cognitive Complexity and Leadership Style in School Superintendents." Ed. D. dissertation, State University of New York at Albany, 1967.

Mondschein, Jules. "Leadership Styles of School Superintendents." Ed. D. dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1974.

Webb, David M. "Modern Management Concepts and Practices in North Carolina Local School Systems." Ed. D. dissertation, Duke University, 1975.